REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 21, and 28 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.[1] No new matter is presented.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-6, 8-10, 14-19, 21-26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Teradaira et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,800,081, hereinafter "Teradaira"); Claims 7, 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teradaira in view of Akiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,378, hereinafter "Akiyama"); and Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Teradaira in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,667,812, hereinafter "Sato").

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the courtesy extended by Examiner Pokrzywa by granting a personal interview to the undersigned on May 3, 2006. During the interview, the pending claims were discussed in light of the applied references and proposed claim modifications were discussed that Examiner Pokrzywa indicated would overcome the current rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected in amended independent Claims 1, 14, 21 and 28, as discussed below. No formal agreement was reached during the interview, pending the submission of an official response to the outstanding Official Action.

In response to the rejection based on Teradaira Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 28 state novel features not taught or rendered obvious by the applied reference.

[1] e.g., specification, p. 23, lines 14-25.

By way of example, amended independent Claim 1 relates to a status information printing program configured to be run on a host computer, and which causes the host computer to print printer status information based on status data received from a printer. The program monitors for status information output from a printer, and acquires the status information upon detecting an output from the printer. The program then generates printing data to print the status information data, which is output to the printer for subsequent printing.

Specifically, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that the program at the host computer includes:

> ...a printing data generation function configured to ***generate printing data to print printer status information indicated by the status information data*** acquired by the status information acquisition function...

Independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21, and 28, while directed to alternative statutory embodiments, recite substantially similar features.

As described in an exemplary embodiment, as disclosed at p. 21-24 of the specification, printer status information is sent to the host computer when, for example, a button on the printer is pushed. The host computer receives the printer status information and generates print data to print printer status information indicated by the received status information of the printer. In such a configuration, the printer is relieved of the burden of processing raw data to generate print data.

Turning to the applied reference, Teradaira describes a printing apparatus including a status data generating circuit. The status data generating circuit generates status data and automatically updates a host computer with status information when it is determined that the generated status data is different from the stored status information (e.g., there is a change in status information).[2] Thus, Teradaira describes a system with a conventional host computer

[2] Teradaira, Abstract.

and printer relationship, but with a modified method of providing updated status information from the printing apparatus to the host computer.

However, as discussed in the interview, Teradaira fails to teach or suggest a configuration which includes transmitting the status information from the printer to the host computer, which ***generates printing data to print printer status information indicated by the status information data***.

Specifically, in addressing the "printing data generation function" recited in independent Claim 1, the outstanding Official Action relies on col. 6, lines 40-59 and col. 8, line 7–col. 9, line 41 of Teradaira. As discussed during the interview, the cited portion of Teradaira describes a method of transmitting updated status information from the printing apparatus to the host computer, so that the host computer can adjust printing properties based on the updated status information. Further, in addressing Claim 8, which recites "causing the host to generate printing data for the printer to print the status information" the outstanding Official Action relies on col. 12, line 49–col. 13, line 45 of Teradaira, which further describes a process of providing updated status information from the printing device. This cited portion of Teradaira also describes how the printing device is able to interpret a command from the host computer as either an automatic status selection setting request or normal printing command.

Therefore, as discussed during the interview, Teradaira describes in detail a method of sending updated status information from the printer to the host computer, but fails to teach or suggest fails to teach or suggest that the host computer ***generates printing data to print printer status information indicated the status information data*** received from the printer, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Teradaira also fails to teach or suggest that the host computer receives raw data from the printer, generates print data, and transmits this data back to the printer for printing. The

advantages of such a system, as discussed above, result in a decreased processing burden on the printer, thereby reducing the cost of the printer by simplifying the design. Teradaira's system, instead, appears to further complicate the design of the printer – to the benefit of the host computer.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent Claims 1, 8, 14, 21 and 28 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

As discussed above, Teradaira fails to teach or suggest the above differentiated features recited in the pending independent claims. Likewise, neither Akiyama nor Sato, neither alone nor in combination remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the cited references, neither alone nor in combination, teach nor suggest Applicant's Claims 7, 12, 13, 20 and 27 which include the above distinguished features by virtue of dependency. Therefore, the cited references fail to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to any of these claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 7, 12, 13, 20 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-28 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this appreciation is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21'S\212054-US\212054 AM 6-8-06.DOC